

persons with whom I am well acquainted but I am well acquainted with a number of those who oppose the measure. So, therefore, I could not support the proposed amendment to LB 290.

PRESIDENT: Senator Moylan.

SENATOR MOYLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise to support Senator Labedz' amendment. I have been contacted by several CPA's in my district, some of them that have been certified and some of them that are working for requirement and they have told me that their experience in the government agencies, in the Office of Revenue, Department of Revenue, is much more thorough and important to their acquiring the CPA certificate than working in private offices. They say they get a wider experience and more technical experience working for the government. So I would ask you to support Senator Labedz' amendment to this bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and I have supported bills in the past to accomplish the same end. Senator DeCamp has indicated to you that his bill does nothing and that is true. This amendment will cause it to do something. What Senator DeCamp is advocating and the CPA's with their bill is a piece of paper that has as much value and significance as those papers they give to make people members, what do they make you, an Admiral in the Nebraska Navy, Senator DeCamp? What kind of nonsense is that? To be a certified public accountant is suppose to be a very serious matter. The CPA's themselves take themselves a lot more seriously than they need to or than other people do and they are not sacred. I don't see any place on the tables that Moses brought down from Mount Sinai anything related to the CPA's, Senator DeCamp. We don't owe them anything, and he said he has all this evidence that they presented to him to show that an amendment like this would reduce the level of professionalism of the CPA's. Now I haven't seen any such evidence and I don't see how they could present something like that to prove the point. First of all, this expediency has never been attempted, so what Senator DeCamp has let these people do, and he is probably impressed and his mind is blown by those letters, CPA, is to tell him, Senator DeCamp, if you had this and if you had that, then you will wind up with the other. But since you don't have this or that, the other is purely speculative as this unto that as Senator DeCamp well knows. Senator DeCamp has no solid arguments to support this bill because when he took it, they told him it was a simple measure which would not bring about controversy but could derail the Labedz train which they knew was in the yard about to come on the tracks, and Senator DeCamp taking their word, feeling that they had done for him what the doctors had done on Senator Schmit's malpractice bill, what the manufacturers and insurance people had tried to do, yes, Senator Luedtke, on LB 142, the products liability bill, but they didn't do their work. All they told Senator DeCamp was Senator DeCamp, CPA, abracadabra, and Senator DeCamp thought that that was going to bedazzle everybody in the way that it bedazzled him but he has not given an argument against what this amendment proposes to do. I can understand the CPA's being against it. If you have a situation where people have to reach enough competency in the field to function as an accountant and the CPA's have a captive market of these people, can work them like serfs or